



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

I do not understand. Notker himself tells us how he was led to compose them. But I am equally at a loss to know why Mr. Tunison regards Notker's master Yso as a "figment" and speaks of him as "supposititious". Is his other master, Marcellus, also a figment, developed from some Greek musical term? Notker himself mentions both with the same apparent good faith, the date of Yso's death is duly recorded in the necrology of St. Gall, and, although legendary elements had possibly crept into the story of his birth by the time Ekkehard IV. wrote, it is clear that he was a real person and that his name was not derived from the Greek term for the basal monotone of a melody, but was probably the vernacular form of Eusebius, his "name-father".

Even in his incidental excursions Mr. Tunison is unfortunate. Whether Guido delle Colonne knew Greek is a matter of little consequence—other men in the Middle Ages certainly did—but apparently he did not, or at least he made no use of his knowledge. Since the appearance of Gorra's *Testi Inediti di Storia Trojana* (1887), scholars have not credited Guido with a knowledge of Dares Phrygius and Dictys Cretensis, to say nothing of Homer. The contents of the *Historia Destructionis Trojae*, even to minute details, are fully accounted for by Benoit de Sainte-More, Virgil, Ovid, and Isidore of Seville.

It is obvious, then, that Mr. Tunison's evidence cannot always be accepted without examination. But the book is, I repeat, distinctly interesting and valuable. It is the work of a scholarly and independent mind; but unfortunately the lack of sound methods produces as strange results in literary history as it used to produce in etymology. In the good old days of unchecked ingenious theorizing it was little trouble to derive an English word from the Hebrew or the Chaldee tongue. We have reformed all that in etymology, but we—not Mr. Tunison only, but professional scholars in some of the highest academic positions in this and other lands—are still pursuing in literary history and other fields of learning the same methods that brought etymology into disrepute. Mr. Tunison, in the scanty leisure of an editorial writer for a daily paper and without ready access to an adequately equipped library, has emphasized for us features in the history of literature and of civilization that have not received due consideration. By its merits no less than by its defects, his book deserves a more elaborate review than space here permits.

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY.

*Le Royaume de Bourgogne (888-1038)*. Étude sur les Origines du Royaume d'Arles. Par RENÉ POUPARDIN, docteur-ès-lettres. [Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques, fascicule 163.] (Paris: Champion. 1907. Pp. xl, 508.)

AMONG the various areas to which, to the confusion of the historical student, the name of Burgundy has at one time or another been attached,

one of the most clearly defined is the kingdom of Burgundy which arose at the break-up of the Carolingian Empire in 888 and joined to itself half a century later the kingdom of Provence. The kingdom thus formed maintained an independent existence until its union with the empire in 1034, and in the imperial system it occupied a distinct place beside Germany and Italy. Although not an ethnic unit, it was composed almost wholly of Romance-speaking peoples; it was never Germanized, and the greater part of it was absorbed piece by piece by France in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

As an historian of independent Burgundy M. Poupardin is admirably qualified. A pupil of Giry, Molinier, and Lot, he has distinguished himself by a volume on the kingdom of Provence and by various special studies in Carolingian history, and he has been designated editor of the Burgundian section in the collection of charters of French sovereigns which the Academy of Inscriptions has in active preparation. These documentary sources are for this period the historian's chief reliance, for there was practically no historical writing of any sort in Burgundy in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and the chroniclers of neighboring lands mention Burgundian affairs only when connected with their own countries. So great is the scarcity of material that the author does not attempt a continuous narrative. He brings together such facts as exist for the reign of each sovereign, and then studies for the period as a whole the character of the royal power and the feudal and ecclesiastical conditions. The material is unfortunately lacking for what would be an instructive comparison with Capetian and German kingship. Thietmar of Merseburg described Burgundian royalty in his day as possessing only the crown and the royal title and as supported at the expense of the bishops, and other indications bear out his characterization. The main interest of this period lies in the development of feudal centres of authority, and M. Poupardin shows how the large *fièfs* were formed and how the bishops acquired the prerogatives of counts in their dioceses. These conditions serve to explain why the kingdom never acquired real unity and why the German emperors found themselves in much the same position as their Burgundian predecessors with relation to the great lay and ecclesiastical princes of the kingdom of Arles. Incidentally the narrative throws light on various aspects of the period, such as the growth of feudal institutions, the Truce of God, and the Saracen and Hungarian invasions. Various special points, notably the relation of *episcopatus* and *comitatus*, are discussed in the appendices. There are genealogical tables and an excellent index. The volume is an excellent type of the French doctor's thesis and a valuable contribution to medieval history.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.